UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,402	09/17/2003	Xin Xue	SONY-26500	9325

28960 7590 07/30/2007
HAVERSTOCK & OWENS LLP
162 N WOLFE ROAD
SUNNYVALE, CA 94086

EXAMINER	
PRICE, NATHAN E	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2194	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/666,402	XUE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Nathan Price	2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 May 2007 and 14 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-83* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-83* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *06/14/2007; 02/21/2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communications received 01 May 2007. Claims 1 – 83 are pending. Previous objections and rejections not included in this Office Action have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 01 May 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues Kloba fails to teach filtering content and selectively sending the filtered content. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Kloba teaches filtering content and selectively sending the filtered content by sending changed objects, possibly involving only a subset of providers [col. 14 lines 46 – 53].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1 – 18 and 20 – 83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kloba et al. (US 6,341,316 B1; hereinafter Kloba).

4. As to claim 1, Kloba teaches a network of devices to filter synchronized data, the network of devices comprising:

a content server to store content [col. 8 lines 15 – 28; col. 12 lines 35 – 45];

a first network device [col. 8 lines 15 – 28; col. 12 lines 35 – 45]; and

a middleware filter coupled to the first network device and to the content server such that during a data synchronization, content is received by the middleware filter from the content server according to the data synchronization and the middleware filter selectively sends the received content to the first network device [col. 5 lines 41 – 52; col. 14 lines 29 – 53; col. 20 lines 15 – 34].

5. As to claim 2, Kloba teaches the content sent by the content server includes metadata [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

6. As to claim 3, Kloba teaches the metadata includes a data type of the content [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

7. As to claim 4, Kloba teaches the middleware filter reads the metadata of the content received from the content server and sends the content to the first network device if the data type of the read metadata matches an authorized data type associated with the first network device [Table 3; col. 6 lines 1 – 38; col. 15 lines 15 – 34].

8. As to claim 5, Kloba teaches the middleware filter stores the authorized data type of the first network device [col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 6; col. 8 lines 31 – 37].

9. As to claim 6, Kloba teaches the metadata includes an authorized network device type [Table 3; col. 5 line 64 – col. 6 line 38].

10. As to claim 7, Kloba teaches the middleware filter reads the metadata of the content received from the content server and sends the content to the first network device if the authorized network device type of the read metadata matches a network device type associated with the first network device [Table 3; col. 5 line 64 – col. 6 line 38].

11. As to claim 8, Kloba teaches the middleware filter stores the network device type of the first network device [col. 4 line 66 – col. 5 line 6; col. 8 lines 31 – 37].

12. As to claim 9, Kloba teaches the metadata is added to the content by the content server [Fig. 1; col. 28 lines 20 – 22].

13. As to claim 10, Kloba teaches the metadata includes data synchronization information corresponding to the data synchronization [col. 22 lines 12 – 37].

14. As to claim 11, Kloba teaches a display coupled to the middleware filter to display the data synchronization information [col. 8 lines 55 – 60; col. 12 lines 59 – 60].

15. As to claim 12, Kloba teaches the data synchronization is a one-way data synchronization [col. 14 lines 46 – 53].

16. As to claim 13, Kloba teaches the data synchronization is a bi-directional data synchronization [col. 5 lines 35 – 40].

17. As to claim 14, Kloba teaches the middleware filter is within a second network device and the second network device comprises a personal computer [col. 8 lines 15 – 28].

18. As to claim 15, Kloba teaches the first network device comprises a PDA [col. 10 lines 32 – 42].

19. As to claim 16, Kloba teaches the content server comprises a web server [col. 4 lines 54 – 58; col. 27 lines 12 – 24].

20. As to claim 17, Kloba teaches the middleware filter is within a second network device and the second network device comprises a server [col. 5 lines 41 – 67; col. 6 lines 25 – 38; col. 14 lines 29 – 53].

21. As to claim 18, Kloba teaches a second network device coupled in between the content server and the first network device, wherein the second network device includes the middleware filter [col. 5 lines 41 – 52; col. 7 line 66 – col. 8 line 7].

22. As to claim 20, see the rejections of claims 1, 14, 15 and 18.

23. As to claims 21 – 33, see the rejections of claims 2 – 13 and 16.

24. As to claim 34, see the rejections of claims 1 and 18.

25. As to claims 35 – 50, see the rejections of claims 2 – 17.

26. As to claim 51, see the rejection of claim 1. Also, see Kloba column 5 lines 41 – 67 and column 20 lines 15 – 18.

27. As to claims 52 – 65, see the rejections of claims 2 – 13, 15 and 16.

28. As to claims 66 – 78, 80 and 81, see the rejections of claims 1 – 13, 15 and 16.

29. As to claim 79, see the rejections of claims 14 and 18.

30. As to claim 82, see the rejections of claims 17 and 18.

31. As to claim 83, see the rejection of claim 1.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

32. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kloba (US 6,341,316 B1).

33. As to claim 19, Kloba at least implies the content server can include the middleware filter because Figure 36 shows the clients connected to the server without showing an external content provider. Furthermore, Kloba teaches the providers can include a server that provides content and is similar to the server 104 shown in Figure 1 [col. 12 lines 35 – 44]. Therefore, it is at least implied that the server in Figure 36 can also provide the content, making it obvious to have the content server include the middleware filter.

Conclusion

34. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

35. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nathan Price whose telephone number is (571) 272-4196. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30am - 3:00pm, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Thomson can be reached on (571) 272-3718. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

NP

WILLIAM THOMSON
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100